



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/061,839	02/01/2002	Edwin A. Monsrud	10739.14.144	2316

22859 7590 01/05/2004

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
4000 PILLSBURY CENTER
200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

RESTIFO, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3618

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/061,839

Applicant(s)

MONSRUD ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey J. Restifo

Art Unit

3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

1. Acknowledgment is made of the amendment filed 10/2/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-10 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 19 recite the phrase "surfaces facing the skag..." it is unclear as to what "surfaces" refers to, or which part has the "surfaces".

Correction required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lachance (US 6,520,512 B1).

Art Unit: 3618

Lachance discloses a snowmobile ski comprising a longitudinal extending runner 20 with bottom surface 32 and upwardly extending curved forward portion 26, a keel 30, a generally flat, elongate wear strip 42 with a pair of downwardly extending, rectangular, integral skags 36,38 defining a channel between the inside surfaces of the skags, wherein the skags taper off at front and rear ends and are positioned more towards the rear of the runner, and the skags include carbide strips 52,53, said ski further comprising an attachment mechanism including a plurality of threaded rods 58,60, secured by nuts 61, as shown in figures 1-6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachance (US 6,520,512 B1).

Lachance discloses a snowmobile ski comprising a longitudinal extending runner 20 with bottom surface 32 and upwardly extending curved forward portion 26, a keel 30, a generally flat, elongate wear strip 42 with a pair of downwardly extending, rectangular, integral skags 36, 38 defining a channel between the inside surfaces of the skags, wherein the skags taper off at front and rear ends and are positioned more towards the rear of the runner, and the skags include carbide strips 52,53, said ski further

Art Unit: 3618

comprising an attachment mechanism including a plurality of threaded rods 58,60, secured by nuts 61, as shown in figures 1-6. Lachance does not disclose the skags as having a length near $1/3$ the length of the ski. Lachance does disclose an extra carbide bar as being $1/3$ the length of the ski length, as recited in claim 11. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the wear strip with skags of Lachance the same length of the carbide strip of Lachance in order to decrease weight and maintain steering control.

With respect to claim 18, simply making components integral is not patentable unless it produces an unexpected result.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/2/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding the newly added limitation of claims 1 and 19, which reads "surfaces facing the skag inside surfaces do not extend laterally toward the inside surfaces, due to the lack of clarity concerning which recited surfaces correspond to which components, the claims have been rejected under 112, and the 102 rejection stands.

With respect to the applicant's arguments concerning claim 16, Lachance discloses an extra carbide strip 34 for aiding in steering that falls within the range of $13/45$ and $16/40$ of the runner length. Further, the exact dimensions of the strips are not patentable unless they produce an unexpected result.

Art Unit: 3618

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding claim 11, the applicant recites the upper skag surface and lower keel surface as being aligned "laterally", the skag and keel surfaces of Lachance are aligned laterally. The applicant appears to be arguing that the keel and skag surfaces are aligned vertically, further, Lachance disclose the skags as having a variable width which could easily include a width wherein the skags are in vertical alignment with the keel lower surface.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3618

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Restifo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:00-6:00), alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Johnson can be reached on (703) 308-0885. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Restifo', with the initials 'JJR' written below it.

December 20, 2003

Jeffrey J. Restifo
Examiner
Art Unit 3618

BRIAN L. JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600